	Case 5:05-cv-02130-JF De	ocument 53	Filed 11/17/08	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	NOT FOR CITATION			
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
11	TOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	TODD D. PICKENS,	,	No. C 05-2130	IF (PR)
13	Petitioner,	{		ING MOTION FOR
14	VS.	{	A CERTIFICA APPEALABIL	TE OF
15	BEN CURRY, Warden,	{		
16	Respondent.	Ś		
17		j	(Docket No. 51)
18		,		
19	On April 25, 2008, the Court denied this <u>pro</u> se petition for writ of habeas corpus			
20	on the merits and entered judgment in favor of Respondent. Petitioner filed for			
21	extensions of time to file a notice of appeal, which the Court granted such that Petitioner			
22	had until July 27, 2008 to file a timely notice of appeal. On July 23, 2008, Petitioner			
23	signed his notice of appeal, which was filed with the Court on July 29, 2008. (Docket			
24	No. 52.) The same day, Petitioner filed a motion for a certificate of appealability.			
25	(Docket No. 51.)			
26	A petitioner may not appeal a final order in a federal habeas corpus proceeding			
27	without first obtaining a certificate of appealability (formerly known as a certificate of			
28	probable cause to appeal). See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). A judge shall			
	Order Denying COA P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JF\HC.05\Pickens130_coa.wpd	1		

grant a certificate of appealability "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The certificate must indicate which issues satisfy this standard. See id. § 2253(c)(3).

"Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the showing required to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: the petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). The Court denied the instant habeas petition after careful consideration of the merits. The Court found no violation of Petitioner's federal constitutional rights in the underlying state court proceedings. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether this Court was correct in its ruling. Accordingly, Petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability (Docket No. 51) is DENIED.

The clerk shall forward to the court of appeals the case file with this order. See Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

United States District Judge

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 11/5/08

27

28

Order Denying COA P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JF\HC.05\Pickens130_coa.wpd